

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 10, 15, 16, and 17 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-17 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 15-17

In the Office Action at page 2, claims 1-3 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,523,028 to DiDomizio, et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,624 to Sampson, et al. or U.S. Patent No. 6,166,730 to Goode, et al. or U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 200200652345 by Guedalia, et al. or U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20010025306 by Ninokata, et al. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a search system for searching design asset information to find information, which a user has privilege to access and which is requested by the user. In relevant part, amended independent claim 1 recites "a processor that accesses the first memory to retrieve design asset information that the user has privilege to access from the design asset information stored in the first memory" and "a second memory that stores a session database in which the retrieved design asset information is collected, wherein the session database is generated when the user starts a session and is deleted when the session is terminated, and wherein the search system searches information requested by the user from the session database." Thus, according to the present invention, the session database, which is created when a user starts a session by, for example, logging in, contains all information that is accessible to a user. If a user requests specific information, a query is run on the session database, rather than the first memory. The session database is deleted when the user exits a session. Independent claims 10, 15, 16, and 17 recite similar features.

DiDomizio, et al. is directed to a method and system for universal querying of distributed databases. DiDomizio, et al. is relied upon only to teach a first memory that stores the design asset information, and a processor that accesses the first memory to retrieve information, which the user has privilege to access, from the design asset information stored in the first memory. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that DiDomizio, et al. fails to teach or suggest "a

processor that accesses the first memory to retrieve design asset information that the user has privilege to access from the design asset information stored in the first memory," as recited in amended independent claim 1.

At pages 2-3, the Office Action acknowledges that DiDomizio, et al. fails to teach or suggest "a memory that stores a session database in which information, which the user has privilege to access, is collected, wherein the session database is generated when the user starts a session and is deleted when the session is terminated, and wherein the search system searches information requested by the user from the session database." Sampson, et al., Goode, et al., Guedalia, et al., and Ninokata, et al. are instead relied upon to teach these features.

Sampson, et al. is directed to session management in a stateless network system. Specifically, the Office Action cites Sampson, et al. at col. 13, lines 55-60 in support of the Examiner's assertion regarding Sampson, et al. The cited portion of Sampson, et al., however, teaches only that each Session Manager object implements methods that carry out several functions, including adding a new session to the database, deleting a session from the database, updating the session, returning session information, revoking sessions associated with a particular user, and returning the status of all sessions managed by the Session Manager. Further, Sampson, et al. teaches that "session information" defines one or more valid sessions between clients and servers. Thus, Sampson, et al. teaches only the creation of a session database for tracking and monitoring sessions. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Sampson, et al. fails to teach or suggest "a second memory that stores a session database in which the retrieved design asset information is collected, wherein the session database is generated when the user starts a session and is deleted when the session is terminated, and wherein the search system searches information requested by the user from the session database," as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Goode, et al. is directed to session management in a stateless network system. Specifically, the Office Action cites Goode, et al. at col. 10, lines 34-54 and col. 16, lines 47-59 in support of the Examiner's assertion regarding Goode, et al. The cited portions of Goode, et al., however, teach only that a session database is constructed at runtime and contains a different database structure for different session types, and that the session database can be deleted. Applicant respectfully submits that Goode, et al. fails to teach or suggest "a second memory that stores a session database in which the retrieved design asset information is collected, wherein the session database is generated when the user starts a session and is deleted when the session is terminated, and wherein the search system searches information requested by the user from the session database," as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Guedalia, et al. is directed to a thin instant messaging proxy interface with persistent sessions. Specifically, the Office Action cites Guedalia, et al. at paragraphs 46-48 in support of the Examiner's assertion regarding Guedalia, et al. The cited portion of Guedalia, et al., however, teaches a central session database that stores session records. Session records "may contain the username, the session identifier and the IP address of the Presence Server 110." Guedalia, et al. at paragraph 46. Further, Guedalia, et al. teaches that if an IM session is not found, the database entry pertaining to that entry can be deleted. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Guedalia, et al. fails to teach or suggest "a second memory that stores a session database in which the retrieved design asset information is collected, wherein the session database is generated when the user starts a session and is deleted when the session is terminated, and wherein the search system searches information requested by the user from the session database," as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Ninokata, et al. is directed to an apparatus and method for managing a session on plurality of media such as e-mail, WEB, voice, etc. Specifically, the Office Action cites Ninokata, et al. at paragraph 249 in support of the Examiner's assertion regarding Ninokata, et al. The cited portion of Ninokata, et al., however, teaches only that "If the user does not perform the information searching process for a predetermined period, then the system 72 deletes the multi-session information from the multi-session management database 92 in the multi-session ID automatically deleting process similar to the process shown in FIG. 12." Applicant respectfully submits, that Ninokata, et al. fails to teach or suggest "a second memory that stores a session database in which the retrieved design asset information is collected, wherein the session database is generated when the user starts a session and is deleted when the session is terminated, and wherein the search system searches information requested by the user from the session database," as recited in amended independent claim 1.

As neither Samspon, et al., nor Goode, et al., nor Guedalia, et al., nor Ninokata, et al. cure the deficiencies of DiDomizio, et al. noted above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

As independent claims 10, 15, 16, and 17 have been amended to recite features similar to those of amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10, 15, 16, and 17, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, also patentably distinguish over the prior art for reasons similar to those of independent claim 1 and, therefore, are in condition for allowance.

Claims 5-10 and 12-14

In the Office Action at page 5, claims 5-10 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DiDomizio, et al. as applied to claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,246,678 to Erb, et al. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 5-9 depend, either directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 1. As Erb, et al. is relied upon only to teach a database server, Applicant respectfully submits that Erb, et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of the cited art noted above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-9 patentably distinguish over the prior art for at least those reasons as claim 1, from which they depend, and are in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 10 has been amended to incorporate features similar to those of amended independent claim 1 and patentably distinguishes over DiDomizio, et al., and Sampson, et al., or Goode, et al., or Guedlaia, et al., or Ninokata, et al. for reasons similar to those of independent claim 1. Again, Erb, et al. is relied upon only to teach a database server. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Erb, et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of DiDomizio, et al., and Sampson, et al., or Goode, et al., or Guedlaia, et al., or Ninokata, et al. noted with respect to amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 10, and those claims 12-14 depending directly or indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.


If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7 February 2006

By: 
Allison Olenginski
Registration No. 55,509

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501